

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed July 22, 2005. Claims 1, 29, 32, 35, 42, 44, and 48 have been amended. Claim 24 has been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-23, 25, and 27-48 are currently pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-13, 15-21, 23-25, and 27-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by “Compumotor, Motion Builder Start-Up Guide & Tutorial” (hereinafter “Compumotor”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Taking amended claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the claim recites as follows:

1. (Currently amended) A computer-implemented method for creating a motion control sequence, the method comprising:
 - displaying a graphical user interface that provides graphical user interface access to a set of motion control operations;
 - receiving user input to the graphical user interface specifying a sequence of motion control operations;
 - automatically generating a graphical program implementing the specified sequence of motion control operations, wherein automatically generating the graphical program comprises automatically including a plurality of nodes in the graphical program and automatically generating a plurality of connections between the nodes, wherein the interconnected nodes visually indicate functionality of the graphical program; and
 - performing the specified sequence of motion control operations. (*Emphasis added*)

Compumotor does not teach or suggest automatically generating a graphical program. In Compumotor, the user manually creates a graphical program. The user manually selects various icons or nodes and includes and positions them in the graphical program (see p. 6 and pp. 70-87). Thus, the icons or nodes in the graphical program are not automatically included in the graphical program, but instead are included in the graphical program in response to user input requesting their inclusion. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites, “automatically including a plurality of nodes in the graphical program”.

Also, in Compumotor, the user manually creates connections between the icons or nodes. For example, p. 87 illustrates an example where a user creates a connection between two icons by using a mouse device to click on the output side of one icon and the input side of the other icon. Thus, the connections between icons in the graphical program are not automatically generated, but instead are generated in response to user input specifying the connections. In contrast, amended claim 1 recites, “automatically generating a plurality of connections between the nodes”.

Thus, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that Compumotor does not teach the elements of, “automatically generating a graphical program implementing the specified sequence of motion control operations, wherein automatically generating the graphical program comprises automatically including a plurality of nodes in the graphical program and automatically generating a plurality of connections between the nodes, wherein the interconnected nodes visually indicate functionality of the graphical program”, as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 29, 32, 35, 42, and 44 recite, among others, a similar limitation not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Compumotor. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 1, 29, 32, 35, 42, 44, and claims dependent thereon for at least the above reasons.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 14 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Compumotor. Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Compumotor and U.S. Patent No. 6,097,887 to Hardikar et al. (hereinafter “Hardikar”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant reminds the Examiner that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant thus respectfully submits that since independent claim 1 has been shown above to be patentably distinct and non-obvious over the prior art, dependent claims 14, 22, and 48 are also patentably distinct and non-obvious.

Applicant also submits that claims 14, 22, and 48, and other dependent claims, recite further distinctions not taught or suggested by the cited references, taken either singly or in combination. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-54200/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 10/24/2005 JCH/JLB